

### Remarks

Claim 1 is amended herein. Claims 1-4 and 6-8 remain pending in the Application.

### Claim Rejections 35 USC 112

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly Claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, Claim 4 is cited as claiming an indefinite standard.

However, Applicant respectfully states that Claim 4 cites the Industry standard "compact peripheral component interconnect standard" that is well known in the art. Furthermore, MPEP 2173.05 states that the meaning of every term should be apparent at the time the application is filed. Therefore, the industry standard for "compact peripheral component interconnect standard", is fixed as of the time the application is filed and is well known in the art. Therefore, the rejection of the industry terms as being indefinite is traversed.

### Rejections under 35 USC 102(b)

#### Claims 1-3

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Radloff (5575546). Applicant has reviewed the Radloff reference and respectfully asserts that Radloff does not anticipate the claimed embodiments of the present invention for the following rationale.

Applicant respectfully states that Independent Claim 1 recites the features of "a locating element coupled to said filler panel body." (emphasis added) The features are described in the Detailed Description (such as paragraphs 0026-0027 among others) and clearly shown in the Figures (e.g., Figure 2, etc).

Applicant has reviewed Radloff and respectfully disagrees with the Examiners assertion that Radloff discloses a locating element coupled to said filler panel body. The Examiner has stated that the post 16f of Radloff is analogous to the locating element of the present invention. However, Applicant understands the post 16f of Radloff to be coupled with the chassis 16, not the filler panel body 14 as the Examiner has recited. That is, applicant understands the chassis 16 of Radloff to include a horizontal shelf 16d having an elevated post 16f therein.

Applicant respectfully points out that the feature of the locating element coupled to the filler panel body as Claimed in the present application is a preliminary step to the final coupling of the filler panel body and components (e.g., the locating element) with the chassis that results in the functionality of the cited art. That is, the locating element is coupled to the filler panel body regardless of whether the filler panel body is coupled with a chassis. Thus, Applicant respectfully states that Radloff does not anticipate the feature of a filler panel body with a locating element coupled therewith.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Radloff does not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claim 1, and as such, Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that Radloff does not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 2-3 which are dependent on an allowable Independent Claim 1, and that Claims 2-3 recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claims 2-3 are allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

#### Rejections under 35 USC 103(a)

##### Claim 4

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 4 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Radloff. Applicant has reviewed the Radloff

reference and respectfully asserts that the claimed embodiments of the present invention are not obvious in view of Radloff for the following rationale.

Applicant respectfully states that Claim 4 is dependent from an allowable Independent Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 4, which depends from an allowable Independent Claim 1, is also in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base Claim and reciting further features of the present claimed invention.

#### Claims 6-8

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 6-8 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Radloff in view of Jones et al. (3986544). Applicant has reviewed the Radloff reference in view of Jones et al. and respectfully asserts that the claimed embodiments of the present invention are not obvious over Radloff in view of Jones et al. for the following rationale.

Applicant respectfully states that Claims 6-8 are dependent from an allowable Independent Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 6-8 which depend from an allowable Independent Claim 1, are also in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base Claim and reciting further features of the present claimed invention.

Conclusion


In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 1-4 and 6-8.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,  
Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

5/23/05

  
\_\_\_\_\_

John P. Wagner, Jr.  
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
(408) 938-9060